



STATE OF WASHINGTON

Washington Educators: Shaping The Future

The 2nd Annual Report of the Washington Professional Educator Standards Board

**Submitted to:
Governor Gary Locke
Washington State Legislature
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Board of Education**

PROFESSIONAL
Educator
STANDARDS
Board

DECEMBER 2001

The PESB gratefully acknowledges the editorial assistance of KSA Plus Communications.

Washington Professional Educator Standards Board

Vision

The vision of the Washington Professional Educator Standards Board (WPESB) is educator quality, recognizing that the highest possible standards for all educators are essential to ensuring attainment of high standards for all students.

Mission

The Washington State Legislature created the WPESB in 2000 through EHB 2760. The mission of the WPESB is to:

- Advise and provide recommendations to the State Board of Education, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Governor and Legislature on the full range of issues affecting education professionals, including: recruitment, hiring, preparation, certification, mentoring, professional growth, retention, governance, assessment, and evaluation;
- Oversee new basic skills and subject matter assessments to be required of all new teachers prior to state certification; and
- Bring greater public focus and attention to education professions.

WPESB Members:

The WPESB, appointed by Governor Locke in July 2000, consists of twenty members:

Tom Charouhas, Chair, Science / technology teacher, Rose Hill Jr. High School, Redmond
Elaine Aoki, Lower school director, the Bush School, Seattle
Carolyn Bradley, Fourth-grade teacher, Isom Intermediate School, Lynden
Carol Coar, School psychologist, Foss High School, Tacoma
Nancy Diaz-Miller, Principal, McKnight Middle School, Renton
Ken Evans, Sixth-grade teacher, Laurin Middle School, Vancouver
Sheila Fox, Interim Executive Director of Extended Education and Summer Programs,
Western Washington University, Bellingham
Vacant, Public Representative
Vacant, Public School Principal
Vacant, Public Higher Education Representative
Tim Knue, Agricultural education teacher, Mount Vernon High School, Mount Vernon
Gary Livingston, Superintendent, Educational Service District 113, Olympia
Kathryn Nelson, Special education teacher, Hamlin Robinson School, Seattle
Helen Nelson-Throssell, Mathematics teacher, Lincoln High School, Tacoma
Martha Rice, Parent Representative, Yakima
Ron Scutt, Lead teacher, Stehekin Elementary, Stehekin
Karen Simpson, Speech and language pathologist, Spokane School District
Yvonne Ullas, First-grade teacher, Naches Primary School, Yakima
Dennis Sterner, Dean, school of education, Whitworth College, Spokane
Terry Bergeson, Superintendent of Public Instruction, ex-officio nonvoting

Staff:

Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director
David Anderson, Assessment Director
Pamela Abbott, Executive Assistant
Kendra Boisvert, Secretary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
A GREAT TEACHER IN EVERY CLASSROOM	4
1. Implementing New Performance-Based Alternative Routes to Teacher Certification.....	4
<i>Figure 1: Alternative Route Program Design.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Table 1: Alternative Route Partnership Grant Recipients</i>	<i>7</i>
2. A New Assessment System for Prospective Teachers.....	9
3. Carrying Forward the Work of the Partnership for Excellence in Teaching: Focus on Recruitment, Retention, Mentoring, and Alternative Models of Compensation	15
LEADERSHIP IN SUPPORT OF LEARNING	22
1. The Role of the Principal in Creating Effective Learning Environments	23
2. Developing a New System Of Principal Preparation and Certification.....	24
3. Recommendations on Principal Prerequisites for State Policymakers	25
<i>Table 2: State Principal Certification Requirements.....</i>	<i>27</i>
4. Implications for Further Study and Policy Development.....	28
EDUCATIONAL STAFF ASSOCIATES – SUPPORTING ALL LEARNERS	30
1. Recognition of ESA National Certification	30
<i>Table 3: ESA state and national certification requirements.....</i>	<i>31-32</i>
2. Salary Recognition for Non-School Experience	33
SUMMARY OF OPTIONS FOR POLICYMAKERS	35
FUTURE FOCUS AND WORKPLAN OF PESB	37
APPENDICES	40
Appendix A: Bulletin and Request for Proposals: Alternative Routes Partnership Grant Program	
Appendix B: Press release on award of Transition to Teaching Grant	
Appendix C: Evaluative criteria for basic skills test proposals	
Appendix D: Press release announcing selection of vendor for basic skills test	
Appendix E: Executive summaries of Partnership for Excellence in Teaching Reports	
Appendix F: PESB meeting 2001 meeting schedule, agendas and budget report	

Washington Educators: Shaping The Future

Without hesitation, parents in Washington will tell you that the most important work in the state is educating their children. Without hesitation, business leaders will tell you that students must be well prepared to take their place in a competitive workforce. Without hesitation, students will tell you they are more likely to be engaged in their learning if their teachers know subject areas well and bring them alive in the classroom.

Without hesitation, we will agree. We are the 20 diverse members of the Professional Educator Standards Board, and there are statements about the reform of education and the significance of the profession that we can make with certainty and assurance. Teaching matters. Leadership counts. Setting clear and high standards will help all children achieve at higher levels, but it is skilled educators who make it happen. We continue to affirm this as the result of research and discovery, discussion and deliberation.

We agree as well that the work of upholding the standards for education professionals should be assigned to educators themselves. We are gratified and honored to be acknowledged as key advisors to the Governor, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Board of Education, and State Legislators. Our inspiration and energy comes from the knowledge that the work that we do will help shape not only the profession of education, but will have a positive impact on the lives of those we serve: the students of Washington State.

Our role is to provide recommendations on issues as directed by state policymakers, and to identify and give counsel on those issues that we believe require attention. Recommendations for alternative routes to certification and development of assessments for prospective teachers were legislative mandates that provided the initial charge for our work. The universe of possible recommendations keeps expanding as we deliberate. If we do our work well, we will operate within a framework that spans the full career of professional educators through four major stages, from recruitment to preparation, to induction, to ongoing professional growth.

Over the course of the year, we have noted the crucial interrelationships between these stages of educator development. We have also noted the unintended consequences that can result when legislative action or program initiatives fail to consider this interrelationship. For example, policy support for recruiting new teachers would be undermined without skilled mentoring in their first year of teaching that is so crucial to retaining beginning teachers. A teacher evaluation system is being piloted that will demand adequate time for intensive reflection on the part of the teacher. The State Board will consider a puzzle piece called state endorsement competencies needed by those who will design the subject knowledge tests for teacher candidates. A set of standards being developed for principals will shape recommendations on the requirements for principal certification. These examples illustrate not only the range of work underway to improve educator quality, but reinforce the need for a board such as the PESB, whose scope of work is sufficiently comprehensive to ensure coherence.

This report is intended to provide policymakers with not only an accounting of our work and activities, but also options and recommendations for improvement that take into careful consideration the landscape of changes in educator quality occurring in Washington and the need to support a coherent continuum of all stages of educator development.

A GREAT TEACHER IN EVERY WASHINGTON CLASSROOM

What teachers know and can do is the most important influence on what students learn. Recruiting, preparing, and retaining good teachers is the central strategy for improving our schools; and school reform cannot succeed without creating the conditions in which teachers can teach and teach well.

– National Commission on Teaching and America's Future

Research confirms what we know from experience to be true: the most important influence on student learning in schools is a well-qualified teacher. Aside from home and family factors, nothing has greater impact – nothing else even comes close. Not class size reduction. Not small schools. The knowledge, skills, and experience of the teacher matters most.¹ Ensuring a comprehensive system that supports well-trained, effective teachers for all students is the defining work of the Professional Educator Standards Board.

2001 Action Summary – Teaching Profession

In response to legislative mandates and committee requests this year the Professional Educator Standards Board:

- 1. Recommended three alternative routes for certification that became the basis of new legislation and a grant program now being implemented by the PESB.**
- 2. Defined the elements of a new basic skills test and selected a vendor to develop this new assessment required of all new teachers prior to certification.**
- 3. Carried forward the work begun by the Partnership for Excellence in Teaching by examining issues related to recruitment and mentoring of teachers, and alternative compensation models for teachers.**

1. IMPLEMENTING NEW PERFORMANCE-BASED ALTERNATIVE ROUTES TO TEACHER CERTIFICATION

State interest in creating alternative routes to teacher certification both in Washington and nationally has been driven by teacher shortages, the desire to draw the “best and brightest” to the teaching profession from other professions, and the desire to add greater diversity to the teaching ranks.

The Professional Educator Standards Board:

- Defined three alternative routes for certification that were enacted in legislation.
- Issued a Request for Proposals to school districts to design alternative routes.
- Awarded grants to districts to develop alternative routes.
- Made joint application with OSPI and received a \$1.2 million Transition to Teaching Grant from the U.S. Department of Education.

¹ Ferguson, R. Paying for Public Education: New Evidence of How and Why Money Matters. *Harvard Journal on Legislation*. 28 (465-98) Summer 1991.

The PESB's report, *Recommendations for High-Quality Alternative Route to Teacher Certification*, was the basis of legislation requested by the Governor, State Board of Education and Superintendent of Public Instruction and enacted by the 2001 Legislature. With the passage of E2SB 5695: Alternative Routes Partnership Grant Program, the legislature provided nearly \$2 million in support for the formation of new programs through which school districts partner with higher education teacher preparation programs to offer one or more of three alternative routes to teacher certification in their districts.

Characteristics of these alternative route programs are:

- **Performance-Based, Mentored Internships** of one year or less complemented by training and coursework on a flexible timetable. The length of the program is determined by the time required for candidates to demonstrate competency related to the standards for the residency teaching certificate. Thus programs are “open exit”, rather than a set period of time for all candidates.
- **Field-Based Partnerships** between districts and higher education preparation programs, with all training and formal learning opportunities provided on or near school district sites, online, or via the K-20 network.
- A **Teacher Development Plan** that specifies the alternative route requirements for each candidate, comparing the candidate's prior experience and educational background with standards for residency certification and adjusting requirements accordingly.

In contrast to traditional programs that require a specific number of courses and hours spent in class, these new partnerships are creating programs that are truly performance-based. They utilize a variety of instructional formats that capitalize on the opportunity for the immediate application of knowledge and skills in classroom settings. Figure 1 below depicts the program design that leads to residency certification, through which the mentored internship is intended to blend classroom teaching experience under the supervision of a trained mentor teacher with formalized learning opportunities within a district.

Figure 1 – Alternative Route Program Design

Summer	Fall	Winter	Spring
Foundations	Instructional Methodology / Assessment		Documentation of Positive impact of Student Learning
Formalized Learning Opportunities	Classroom Experience / Responsibility		
Teacher Development Plan	Performance Benchmark Check Point	Performance Benchmark Check Point	Performance Benchmark Check Point

The three types of alternative route programs include:

- Route 1:** for classified instructional staff with transferable associate degrees, currently employed in a district and seeking residency teacher certification with primary endorsements in special education or English as a second language.
- Route 2:** for classified staff with baccalaureate degrees or higher, currently employed in a district and seeking residency certification in subject matter shortage areas or areas with shortages due to geographic location.
- Route 3:** for individuals who are not currently employed in the district, or who hold emergency substitute certificates, and hold a baccalaureate degree or higher. Priority is given to individuals seeking residency certification in subject matter shortage areas or areas with shortages due to geographic location.

Following the passage of the Alternative Routes Partnership Grant Program, the PESB and its staff presented at numerous conferences and meetings of associations to build awareness of this new program, including:

- WA Association of School Administrators/Association of WA School Principals Annual Conference
- WA Educational Research Association
- OSPI Annual Conference
- WA Federation of Independent Schools
- WA Association of Colleges of Teacher Education
- OSPI/AWSP Leadership Summit
- State Board of Education
- Educational Service District Superintendents
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future
- Professional Education Advisory Boards Annual Conference
- Washington State PTA Legislative Conference
- Washington State PTA Education Reform Implementation Task Force
- WA Education Association Board of Directors

In addition, the PESB has received requests from other states and national organizations seeking information on how they might replicate Washington's alternative routes program.

Response on the part of Washington citizens interested in becoming teachers through the new alternative routes has been overwhelming. Since the passage of the legislation, the PESB office has received hundreds of phone calls, letters and emails requesting information. In response, PESB staff created a segment of our Web site specifically designed to guide interested prospective teachers through a series of questions to determine whether they are eligible for alternative routes.

I am very interested in your upcoming program. While earning a Master's Degree in Instructional Technology, I piloted an interactive learning system for a school district. This required me to manage 30 classes of K-2 students per week in a computer lab and conduct staff development training at the same time. For the preceding two years I worked as an elementary school paraeducator. My passions are for children, technology, and teaching. All I need now is a certificate. [e-mail received by PESB]

Since August 10, 2001 the PESB website has received:

- 4,688 hits to the question “Do you qualify for alternative routes?”
- 2,081 indicated they are qualified for one of the three alternative routes (1,463 Route 3)
- 1,213 did not qualify and were linked to OSPI’s certification office Web site for information on other preparation program options.
- Over 2,000 people signed up to be notified of district programs once the grants were awarded.

I have been a special education para-educator in a Washington school district for six years. I can't tell you how excited I am about the opportunity this new alternative route program is going to provide. I must admit I am chomping at the bit to find out more information and to get started. I would appreciate it if you could please put me on your mailing or email list and keep me posted on any and all new information. Thank you!
[e-mail received by PESB]

On September 14, the PESB issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) to all Washington school districts. A copy of this RFP is contained in Appendix A. On October 16th, the PESB, in collaboration with the certification office of OSPI, conducted a planning meeting for interested districts and their higher education partners. The purpose of the meeting was to assist districts and their higher education partners, as well as their ESD partners where applicable, in designing key components of their performance-based alternative route programs. Representatives from 30 districts, 11 higher education preparation programs, and four ESDs attended this meeting.

Eight proposals representing 50 school districts, three Educational Service Districts (ESDs), seven higher education teacher preparation programs (5 private, 2 public), and one community college were received by the PESB by the November 16 deadline. A review committee of PESB members and staff, and the director of professional education and certification for OSPI, reviewed the proposals and submitted a report with ratings of each proposal to the PESB at its November 27-28 meeting. Funds from the legislature allowed the PESB to award three partnership grants that will prepare 65 new teachers through alternative route programs. Each of these partnerships includes substantial in-kind funding from the districts involved to further support and expand their programs. Table 1 depicts the partnership grant recipients.

Table 1 – Alternative Route Partnership Grant Recipients

Grant Recipient	Districts	Higher Ed Partner	ESD	Routes
Southwest Washington Consortium for Teacher Development	Battle Ground, Camas, Castle Rock, Evergreen, Longview, Keko, Ocean Beach, Stevenson-Carson, Vancouver, Washougal, White Salmon, Woodland	City University Northwest Regional Educational Labs	112	1, 2, 3
The South Sound Partnership	Auburn, Clover Park, Franklin Pierce, Puyallup, Sumner, Tacoma	Pacific Lutheran University Green River Community College	N/A	1, 2, 3
Puget Sound Partnership for Alternative Routes to Teacher Certification	Bethel, Dieringer, Enumclaw, Federal Way, Highline, Kent, Lake Washington, Mercer Island, Northshore, Orting, Renton, Riverview, Seattle, Skykomish, Snoqualmie Valley, Steilacoom, Tahoma, Tukwila, University Place, Vashon Island, White River	Seattle Pacific University	Puget Sound ESD	2, 3

Because demand for these programs far exceeds the funding received, districts that applied are looking for other sources of funding to operate alternative route programs and the PESB has pursued and will continue to watch for opportunities to seek funding to support alternative route programs.

Federal Grant to Expand Alternative Routes

Washington State will expand its support for district partnerships operating Route 3 programs with a grant from the U.S. Department of Education.

The PESB and OSPI jointly applied and were awarded a \$1.2 million Transition to Teaching Program Grant, the largest of the 14 state grants awarded. This program, aimed at recruiting individuals with subject matter expertise from other fields into teaching through alternative routes, will provide funding for:

- Mentor and intern stipends
- Tuition assistance
- Mentor training
- Teacher recruitment activities
- First-year teacher mentoring
- Program evaluation

We anticipate that this support will enable as many as 120 additional prospective teachers currently working outside education to become fully certified teachers in the next two years. Unfortunately, the focus of the federal grant prohibited expansion of the alternative routes for classified instructional staff (Routes 1 and 2). Appendix B contains the press release on Washington's receipt of the Transition to Teaching Grant.

Next Steps for Alternative Routes to Teaching in Washington

The PESB will issue a Request for Proposals for the Transition to Teaching Program in mid-late January. Identifying individuals in other fields to be candidates in these programs is more difficult for districts than identifying interns from among their own classified instructional staff. The PESB will continue to help link the many individuals contacting us with interest in becoming a teacher with districts interested in offering alternative route programs. In addition, the PESB is working with the business community to bring together representatives from major Washington employers with representatives from school districts in which these companies are located to discuss ways they might work together to support retiring or downsized employees pursuing teaching as a second career through alternative route programs.

The first round of the state-funded alternative route partnership grant program and the new Transition to Teaching Program grant program will yield important information about the ability of these types of field-based programs to reach and serve Washington's many rural and remote districts, many of whom are experiencing severe shortages. The PESB will continue to examine better ways to recruit and prepare educators for service in these districts.

Continued Study of Alternative Routes to Teaching in Washington State

The December 2000 Professional Educator Standards Board report, Recommendations for High-Quality Alternative Routes to Teacher Certification, noted on page twenty-four a proposal for further study, “Proposal Needing Further Consideration and Study – District Certificate.” A PESB committee was formed in July 2001 to study New Jersey’s Provisional Teacher Program – Alternate Route, which has a district component to it. The committee will make a presentation at the PESB meeting on January 8, 2002. The evaluation of our Alternative Partnership Grant Program will yield important information regarding the necessity for other innovative types of preparation programs in Washington State. In the meantime, the PESB will continue to study this and other innovative teacher preparation programs being used in other states.

OPTION FOR STATE POLICYMAKERS TO CONSIDER

Even if access to programs is extended and even with new federal funds and potential assistance from the business community, it is clear that the demand for these type of alternative route programs far exceeds the available funds for tuition assistance and stipends to support them. Districts are most interested in providing opportunities for classified instructional staff, yet these potential teacher candidates will not be able to participate in the new federally funded program or receive tuition assistance from the Conditional Loan Scholarship Program (no longer funded by the state). The Washington State Institute for Public Policy’s evaluation of the first round of grants will include examining what aspects of these programs are in most need of support, and how funds might be leveraged differently in the future. Should state policymakers look at expanding support for alternative route programs, the PESB recommends that the efforts be directed at expanding access and support for classified instructional staff.

2. A NEW ASSESSMENT SYSTEM FOR PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS

As Washington has established new, higher standards for what all students should know and be able to do, more is required of our teachers as well. Although all 22 of our state’s approved higher education teacher preparation programs have basic skills requirements for admission to their programs, they vary considerably. The Governor, Legislature, State Board of Education, and Superintendent of Public Instruction proposed establishing a single, uniform means of assessing basic skills competency of all teaching candidates statewide.

The Professional Educator Standards Board:

- Developed specifications for a basic skills test for prospective teachers
- Issued an RFP based on those specifications
- Selected a review panel and a technical advisory group to assist in reviewing proposals and products
- Awarded a contract for development of a basic skills test to National Evaluation Systems

The law that established the PESB directed the Board to develop and implement an assessment system for prospective teachers in Washington State composed of two parts: (1) a basic skills test and (2) subject knowledge tests. The Legislature directed the Board to implement the basic skills test first.

Developing a Fair, Technically Sound and Legally Defensible Basic Skills Test

The law further specifies that the basic skills test should measure knowledge and skills in reading, writing and mathematics. The timeline given to the PESB for the implementation of the basic skills test calls for piloting to begin September 1, 2001, and for the test to be required beginning September 1, 2002. The requirement to pass the basic skills test beginning September 1, 2002 governs students applying to approved teacher preparation programs in the state of Washington and to persons from out-of-state applying for a Washington State residency-teaching certificate. Washington joins 45 other states in requiring teachers to pass a basic skills test prior to certification.

The law gives the PESB the authority to establish exceptions to this requirement, for example, individuals from other states who have demonstrated proficiency through a similar test. The PESB may permit other exceptions on a case-by-case basis.

RFP Specifications for the Basic Skills Test

The PESB directed staff to seek competitive proposals for the development and implementation of the basic skills test as mandated by RCW 28A.410.220, and established a sub-committee to oversee this process. This subcommittee and PESB staff developed a set of program requirements and detailed specifications in the form of a Request for Proposals (RFP). The Board approved the RFP at its April meeting and issued the RFP in May.

The basic skills test must be valid, reliable and fair for all examinees. The RFP specifications addressed the three major areas of assessment quality, test administration, and scoring and reporting.

To address the issue of assessment quality, the RFP specified:

- The test should be developed and implemented according to professional standards developed by the American Psychological Association, the American Educational Research Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education.
- The vendor should support an independent technical advisory committee to oversee the development and implementation of the basic skills test and advise the PESB. This committee is to be comprised of national and state experts on assessment and teacher testing issues.
- A high level of involvement of Washington educators is necessary at every step of the test development process.
- A determination of the knowledge and skills to be measured by the basic skills test through a detailed job analysis. Content advisory committees comprised of Washington educators will make sure that the test is designed to adequately measure these skills.
- Selection of a fairness committee of Washington educators to make sure that the test does not adversely impact specific groups of examinees. This fairness committee will represent the diverse populations that make up the teaching force in Washington.
- Technical documentation by the contractor to provide information on the steps and actions taken in the development and implementation of the basic skills test. This documentation will facilitate independent review and oversight of the basic skills test.

To address the issue of test administration and ensure that those taking the test are served in a convenient and professional manner, the RFP specified:

- The vendor should offer options for applicants to be able to register for the test by telephone, via the Internet or by mail.
- The vendor should provide sufficient numbers of test sites and test administration time for the convenience of the examinees.
- Testing sites should be located within close proximity to most of the examinees across the state and near the teacher preparation programs.
- There should be a minimum of six testing dates per year to include both weekend and mid-week test administrations.
- Test security must be maintained to ensure the fairness for all examinees. The RFP required vendors to file plans to ensure the security of the basic skills test.

To address the issue of scoring and reporting scores, the RFP specified:

- Vendors must file quality assurance plans to insure that the scoring of the basic skills test is valid and reliable.
- Vendors must submit plans to return test scores to the examinee within four weeks.
- Vendors must supply the state and institutions with appropriate summary reports on the test results.

Other requirements included:

- Provisions for an online version of the basic skills test;
- Testing accommodations for examinees with special needs;
- Specifications for test retakes;
- Publication of test preparation materials; and
- Provisions for a fee assistance program for examinees with financial needs.

Proposal Review

On March 15, 2001, an announcement of the intended release of the RFP was mailed to a list of more than 20 potential bidders who have demonstrated their prior experience and interest in projects of this size and complexity. On May 15, the RFP was publicly released with a due date for responses of June 27, 2001. In addition, a legal notification of the release was placed in the media, the release was announced on the Internet, and the RFP was posted in downloadable form on the PESB website.

Proposals were received from Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, and National Evaluation Systems, Inc., Amherst, Massachusetts.

A review panel was chosen to assist in the evaluation of the lengthy and complex responses to the RFP. The review panel represents a balance of experience and expertise in measurement, assessment, curriculum and professional development:

Gordon Ensign, former Director of Assessment, Commission on Student Learning

Duncan MacQuarrie, Testing Director, Tacoma Public Schools

Kathy Kimball, Director, Danforth Educational Leadership Program and Associate Professor, University of Washington

William Mehrens, Professor, Michigan State University

Tom Charouhas, Chair, PESB

Dennis Sterner, Dean, Whitworth College

Gary Livingston, Superintendent, ESD 113

David Anderson, Assessment Director, PESB

In addition to professional expertise, each member of the review panel had a good understanding of the goals for this project. The evaluative criteria used to judge each proposal is found in Appendix C.

On July 20, the review panel met together for more than eight hours to share initial impressions and analyze the proposals based on the review criteria and their responsiveness to the major components of the RFP. Because each reviewer brought different professional expertise to the task, the group discussions afforded the opportunity for individuals to share insights and raise questions that may have been missed by others on the panel.

The Professional Educator Standards Board met on September 25, 2001 to select a vendor to assist with the implementation of the Basic Skills test. After deliberations, the Board voted to award a contract for this work to National Evaluations Systems. The press release announcing the Board's selection is found in Appendix D.

Contractor flexibility, sensitivity to the need for broad involvement, corporate capacity and experience, and demonstrated ability to deliver timely, high quality products and services were very important considerations in the selection of a vendor. In the judgment of the Board, National Evaluation System's proposal provided the most cost effective package that also met these criteria. National Evaluation Systems (NES) has provided states with customized teacher certification testing programs for 25 years. Currently, prospective teachers in eight states (California, Illinois, New York, Texas, Michigan, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Massachusetts) take basic skills tests that have been developed and administered by NES.

Next Steps for A New Assessment System

- The Board will convene advisory groups to assist in the creation of the basic skills test; develop specifications and issue an RFP for subject knowledge tests
- A number of development activities must take place during the pilot year to implement the basic skills test for September 2002. These activities include a job analysis, development of test frameworks and test items, content and fairness reviews and field-testing of test items.

Involving Washington Educators in the Creation of a Basic Skills Test

The first step is to convene advisory groups to assist the PESB. A technical advisory committee (TAC) of seven experts has been selected and will have an initial meeting on December 5. The

purpose of a technical advisory committee is to advise the Board on the legal and technical issues in the implementation of the basic skills test. Because this is a high stakes test the expert advice will be crucial in the Board's oversight of this project. The TAC will review the vendor's plans and schedule of activities to ensure that the vendor is following professional standards in the implementation of this program. The TAC will pay close attention to make sure that the basic skills test is valid, reliable and fair for all examinees. Furthermore the TAC will advise the Board on policy options that will address the legal defensibility of the test as well as the psychometric soundness of the basic skills test.

The members of the technical advisory committee are:

Gordon Ensign, former Director of Assessment, Commission on Student Learning

Duncan MacQuarrie, Testing Director Tacoma Public Schools

Kathy Kimball, Director, Danforth Educational Leadership Program and Associate Professor, University of Washington

William Mehrens, Professor, Michigan State University

Stephen Klein, Research Scientist, Rand Corporation

Linda Darling-Hammond, Professor, Stanford University

George Engelhard, Professor, Emory University

Involvement of Washington educators is also critical for the success of the basic skills test. Two content advisory committees composed of Washington teachers and representatives of teacher preparation programs will be convened to advise on the development of the basic skills test, one for Reading and Writing and one for Mathematics. The qualifications for these committees are that the members should be well grounded in their content area and representative of the diversity of the Washington teaching force. Content advisory committees will review the result of a job analysis to determine what basic skills in reading writing and mathematics are necessary for teachers. These committees will also review test blueprints, test items and test forms to ensure that those skills are adequately measured by the basic skills test.

A fairness committee will be convened to ensure that the basic skills test is not biased and is fair for all examinees. The fairness committee, composed of representatives from the diverse populations that compose the Washington teaching force will review the test blueprint, test items and test forms to make sure that the test is a fair measure of basic skills for all prospective teachers in Washington.

After test items are written and reviewed for content and fairness, these items will be field tested in the spring to collect data in order to judge their technical soundness prior to including items on operational test forms. The field-testing of test items will be conducted with a sample of examinees that are representative of all prospective teachers in Washington. This will be an opportunity to collect data to judge the fairness of the tests as well as the soundness of the test items.

Developing an RFP for Subject Knowledge Tests

The second part of the prospective teacher assessment system mandated by RCW 28A.410.210 is the development and implementation of subject knowledge tests. The law requires that these tests be piloted beginning in September 2002 and be required for certification endorsements beginning in September 2003. The law also states that these tests should not measure "teaching

methodology.” Assessment of teaching methodology is conducted by each individual teacher preparation program using a performance-based assessment.

To fulfill this legal mandate the PESB will seek a vendor or vendors through a competitive bidding process to implement these tests. The Board is scheduled to approve and issue an RFP for the subject knowledge tests in January 2002 for vendors to begin work in the spring of 2002.

Implementing the Subject Knowledge Test

The foundation of the subject knowledge tests will be the Washington State endorsement competencies. Endorsement competencies define what beginning teachers should know and be able to do in terms of subject matter knowledge that they wish to be certified to teach. These competencies are a product of a process of development, review, and revision directed by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The State Board of Education is scheduled to adopt these new competencies at its January 2002 meeting. There are 32 different endorsement areas and the PESB will make available a separate test for each endorsement area. Endorsement areas for a residency teaching certificate are:

Designated Arts: Dance	English Language Arts
Designated Arts: Drama	English as a Second Language
Designated Arts: Music: Choral	Family and Consumer Sciences
Designated Arts: Music: General	Education
Designated Arts: Music:	Health and Fitness
Instrumental	History
Designated Arts: Visual Arts	Library Media
Designated Arts: Visual Arts	Marketing Education
Designated Science: Biology	Math
Designated Science: Chemistry	Middle Level
Designated Science: Earth Science	Reading/Literacy
Designated Science: Physics	Social Studies
Designated World Languages	Science
Early Childhood Education	Special Education
Early Childhood Special Education	Technology Education
Elementary Education	Traffic Safety

RECOMMENDATION FOR STATE POLICYMAKERS

The adoption of these new competencies present a dilemma for the implementation of valid and fair subject knowledge tests within the timeline mandated by the Legislature. Once the competencies are adopted by the state, higher education institutions will align requirements for students with these competencies. The subject knowledge tests will be valid measures for students completing their preparation programs under these new requirements. For students completing their programs under the old requirements, these tests will be inappropriate measures of their knowledge and skills. Therefore, to permit adequate implementation of these new performance-based requirements by teacher preparation programs and to be fair to teacher candidates, the subject knowledge tests should be implemented after candidates have had the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills defined by the state competencies. When the State Board of Education adopts these new endorsements competencies, they will also adopt new WAC that will require teacher preparation programs to implement the new competencies by

September 1, 2003 and will permit students accepted into teacher preparation programs prior to that date to apply for endorsements under the old requirements until August 31, 2005. Therefore, it is the recommendation of the PESB that the subject knowledge tests not be required for residency certification until September 1, 2005 to accommodate the State Board's timeline.

The PESB will move forward according to current legislated timeline in making the subject knowledge tests available by September 1, 2003. Post-baccalaureate teacher preparation programs and alternative route programs will be interested in using these assessments for program admission purposes since their students are presumed to have completed their subject area requirements prior to admission.

3. CARRYING FORWARD THE WORK OF THE PARTNERSHIP FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING

We also believe state leaders need to join with local leaders to think through and consider more difficult and more comprehensive changes to the state's teaching system. Thus, in this report, we also carefully detail the issues and questions that ought to guide future deliberations. We hope to prod the debate and give policy-makers ideas about how they can work to improve teaching – and thereby ensure students can achieve the highest standards – in Washington State.

- A Great Teacher for Every Child, Washington Partnership for Excellence in Teaching

The PESB was created on the heels of an important collaborative initiative, the Partnership for Excellence in Teaching (PET). PET convened representatives from the Governor's office, OSPI, State Board of Education, Higher Education Coordinating Board, teacher preparation programs, a dozen professional educator associations, parent organizations and the business community over a two-year period. Their work culminated in the release of two reports:

- Status of Teaching in Washington State
- A Great Teacher for Every Child: Recommendations for Washington State

These reports presented data and information on various aspects of teaching quality in Washington, broad policy goals, specific policy actions that can be taken now, and tougher policy issues that still need to be tackled. Appendix E contains the executive summaries of these reports.²

PET examined the wide range of Washington's formal and informal systems for the recruitment, preparation and ongoing development of teachers. They looked at what was working in these systems and what gaps exist from a systems perspective and they considered what it would take to make systems more coherent and effective.

As a board charged with helping policymakers identify more coherent, systemic approaches to improving teacher quality, the PESB was handed these reports and recommendations when the PET project concluded, so that we might continue to explore and advance the issues surfaced through this important work.

² Copies of these reports may be obtained from the PESB office – call (360) 725-6275.

Over the course of the year the PESB has continued examining and discussing the work of PET, and will continue to do so, with particular emphasis in three areas:

- Recruitment and Retention of Teachers
- Mentoring of Preservice and Beginning Teachers
- Alternative Models of Teacher Compensation

Recruitment/Retention: Getting and Keeping the Teachers We Need

Washington State is experiencing teacher shortages that will likely get worse in the near future. In the next five years a startling 14%, or approximately 8,400, currently employed teachers will be eligible for retirement. The 2001 Legislature's retire/rehire bill will undoubtedly help in curbing this departure rate, but the impact is not yet known. This rate does not include the growing numbers of teachers who are choosing to leave the profession for reasons other than retirement. In addition, the number of people becoming certified teachers has declined overall over the last decade. A 2000 study of educator supply and demand in Washington revealed considerable shortages, or districts with vacancies "extremely difficult to fill", in the teaching fields of special education, chemistry, physics, biology, science, Japanese, bilingual education, math, library media, business education, and technology education, and in no fields was there reported a surplus of available teachers.

To fill shortages in specific fields, some districts have sought to employ individuals without adequate preparation for teaching through state provisions for emergency and conditional certificates. This past year alone, the number of emergency and conditional certificates issued by the state increased by 35%.

Efforts to recruit greater numbers of teachers and teachers with diverse backgrounds have been sporadic. For the most part, school districts are left to develop their own recruitment and retention programs and to compete against one another for the diminishing supply.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS FOR STATE POLICYMAKERS TO CONSIDER

What can be done to impact teacher recruitment and retention in these times of fiscal constraint is a difficult question, nevertheless there are steps that are being taken and more that can be taken in Washington State to help attract and retain the teachers we need.

▪ *Clearer, More Easily Accessible Information on How to Become A Teacher*

In the course of answering the hundreds of phone calls, letters, and emails from individuals interested in alternative routes to teaching, the PESB has learned a great deal about the type of questions prospective teachers have and the frustration and difficulty they encounter finding clear answers. The PESB and OSPI's certification office have collaborated to make available more easily accessible links to information on teacher preparation options. But more needs to be done to direct people to sites and to provide them with clearer, jargon-free information and options.

One example of this is an effort by a new nonprofit organization (You'd Be A Great Teacher) to implement a new public service campaign of the same name that will focus on positively marketing the rewards of a teaching career and provide easily accessible, clear information on options for getting into teaching. The PESB connected this effort

with a Title II-funded effort at the University of Washington-Tacoma that is creating a web site with clear and easily searchable information on various preparation program options. It is this combination of expertise in marketing and communications and expertise on teacher preparation options that can help ensure that individuals interested in pursuing a teaching career can have their basic and detailed questions clearly answered, and explore options that fit their lifestyle and financial situation.

- ***Longer-Term Strategies for Addressing Projected Shortages***

By focusing the Alternative Route Partnership Grant Program on helping districts address teacher shortages, state policymakers took important steps toward filling those shortages and raising awareness about where shortages exist and in what teaching fields. Effective strategies for addressing shortages go beyond filling current vacancies; they project and consider future shortages and influence the stream of incoming prospective teachers accordingly.

Students considering enrollment in a teacher preparation program are often counseled to consider pursuing majors and teaching endorsements in shortages areas. However, without financial incentives to do so, students tend to pursue subject areas of greatest interest.

Projecting longer-term can also mean focusing earlier, on younger students, as future teachers. Programs such as Teachers Recruiting Future Teachers (TRFT) provides middle and high school students in 20 high school teaching academy programs in 19 school districts with coursework in teaching and learning and other educational issues as well as an internship experience for high school students. Policymakers should consider ways to encourage articulation between these programs, community colleges and four-year institutions. For example, students in teaching academy programs could receive credit toward community college or teacher preparation program requirements.

Policymakers should also consider new ways to encourage higher education to take into account current and projected teacher supply and demand in planning for additions or reductions to educator preparation program offerings and in their enrollment practices. The Higher Education Coordinating Board has taken steps in the past to target additional SFTEs for high need school personnel areas, but of the 22 higher education teacher preparation programs, only 8 are public institutions and subject to these types of policy incentives.

- ***Improved Coordination and Management of Statewide Recruitment***

Washington has some statewide recruitment efforts in place. OSPI sponsors WATeach.com, an educator employment database where districts post vacancies, and the Washington School Personnel Association annually hosts two highly successful career fairs attended by thousands of teachers. What is still needed, however, is a coordinated statewide recruitment system driven by data projecting which districts will have shortages and in what areas, and targets recruitment efforts accordingly. For example, states that are aggressively recruiting teachers to fill shortages focus statewide, intentionally minimizing competition among districts by helping market all communities with shortages with the aim of matching qualified candidates with those communities.

But for Washington to compete with states like California and Nevada it will clearly take more than better coordination. States that are aggressively recruiting teachers to fill shortages are doing so with attractive packages of competitive salaries and benefits. Some districts in Washington have begun offering incentives such as signing bonuses, but this practice exacerbates inequities and competitiveness because these incentives are provided with local levy dollars.

- ***Improved Data for Decision Making***

Having more coordinated focused statewide strategies for recruitment requires reliable data. Last year, OSPI completed the first ever teacher supply and demand report for Washington. This provided valuable information for policymakers, districts, and schools of education. But overall Washington needs to financially support a better-coordinated, comprehensive data-collection system that can identify needs in the state's teacher workforce. Supply and demand data needs to be collected on an annual basis, identify shortages regionally, and relate to regional student enrollment projections and teacher preparation program capacity by region.

- ***Recruiting for Diversity***

In addition to lacking adequate numbers of qualified teachers, Washington lacks diversity in its teacher workforce. Although 25% of our student population are students of color, only 7% of certified teachers and 10% of individuals currently enrolled in teacher preparation programs are people of color.³

Efforts to improve recruiting for diversity must go beyond doing a better job of filling vacancies with certified teachers of color. We must examine the effectiveness of systems of recruitment to determine whether they are reaching communities of color and encouraging students of color to pursue a future career in teaching. How are we marketing/advertising? Where are we recruiting? Who are we encouraging to pursue teaching? Studies show that some strategies work better than others in terms of recruiting for diversity utilizing nontraditional networks, understanding how diverse prospective teachers perceive the profession in Washington, utilizing a support and recruitment network of teachers of color, expanding opportunities for paraprofessionals to become fully-certified teachers, and recruiting future teachers by raising interest of middle and high school students in a teaching career⁴.

A good example of recruiting for diversity by focusing on middle and high school students is the Future Teachers of Color Program at Washington State University. This program targets minority high school juniors and seniors, providing hands-on experience regarding careers in education and college life and scholarship opportunities, with the goal of recruiting minorities to teaching before they enter the university.

³ Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. *Educator Supply and Demand in Washington*. Olympia, WA. 2001.

⁴ Jorgenson, O. Supporting a Diverse Teacher Corps. *Educational Leadership*. pp. 64-67. May, 2001.

Supporting Preservice and Beginning Teachers with Skilled Mentoring

A significant factor in the retention of beginning teachers is the provision of a high-quality induction/mentoring program. A National Center for Educational Statistics study found that for new teachers who had participated in an induction program, the attrition rate within the first three years of teaching was 11% lower than the attrition rate of teachers who had not received any induction support.⁵ Some districts, like Cincinnati, Columbus, and Toledo, Ohio and Rochester, New York, have reduced attrition rates of beginning teachers by more than two-thirds (often from levels exceeding 30% to rates of under 5%) by providing expert mentors with release time to coach beginners in their first year on the job.⁶

Beyond the basic first-year survival and emotional support that mentoring provides, induction helps beginning teachers make real improvements in specific knowledge and skills. A good induction program can help beginning teachers build a solid foundation toward the next formal step, the professional certificate.

In 2001, the legislature enacted budget provisions that changed funding and program requirements for Washington's Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (TAP). These changes were at least in part a response to a 1999 study of the TAP by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy. This study pointed to the need for more consistent standards and quality of beginning teacher induction and mentoring statewide.⁷ In addition to an increase in overall funding for TAP, the proviso language included new requirements of TAP recipients such as:

- An orientation process and individualized assistance for new teachers before the start of the school year;
- Greater specificity regarding the mentor's responsibilities and required areas in which mentors are to provide training and guidance;
- Provision of release time, substitutes, or other means of ensuring ample time for mentors to observe and assist beginning teachers; and
- Mentor assistance of new teachers in developing a professional growth plan that includes self-evaluation and informal performance assessments.

A key component of a high-quality induction program is well-trained mentor teachers. The 2001 budget also provided \$200,000 each year of the biennium to "operate a mentor academy to help districts provide effective training for peer mentors." Last summer OSPI sponsored two training academies for 180 mentor teachers representing 70 schools districts. Two PESB members had the opportunity to participate in the training academy and, together with the other participants, evaluated it very highly. The challenge now, however, particularly given current fiscal constraints, is how to ensure that all mentors have access to training of high and consistent quality.

It is difficult for a centralized model to serve the number of mentors needed across all 296 districts. For those districts without the capacity to provide their own mentor training, the training academy is an extremely valuable opportunity. For larger districts, however, it may

⁵ National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. *NCTAF Urban Initiative Partners Newsletter*. New York, NY. Summer, 2000.

⁶ Darling-Hammond, L. *Solving the Dilemmas of Teacher Supply, Demand, and Standards*. New York, NY. 2000.

⁷ Harding, E., McLain, B., Anderson, S. *Teacher Preparation and Development*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy. 1999.

prove impractical. In moving forward, the PESB recommends that policymakers support a model of mentor training that:

- Includes a “trainer of trainers” track so that large districts or districts unable to send multiple individuals to the state academy can send staff who will in turn train district mentors;
- Provides evaluation and technical assistance to districts already providing mentor training programs on how they might improve their training and better align it with statewide goals;
- Provides a separate “track” of mentor training for mentors of preservice interns in alternative route programs.

Analyzing Washington's Compensation Model

In a 1999 Washington State Institute of Public Policy survey, 43% of beginning teachers cited “salary level” as the top reason that might cause them to leave the profession within their first five years.⁸

Washington must address three challenges to its current teacher compensation schedule: the need to compete with other states offering significantly higher salaries and attractive benefits, other career options available to teachers for better pay, and the escalating cost of living in many Washington communities. The PET report stated and many policymakers agree, *“The state’s salary allocation schedule distributes school funding equitably, but perpetuates a one-size-fits-all approach to teacher salaries. The schedule doesn’t recognize specialized skills, different responsibilities, or regional cost of living differences. And state rules make it next to impossible for school districts to pay special incentives to teachers to take on special teaching assignments.”*

In September, the PESB convened a compensation study group composed of technical staff from the Office of Financial Management, OSPI, and WEA to work collaboratively over an 18-month period. The goals of this study group are to:

1. Develop knowledge of the current compensation structure being used in Washington State. Capture both the state and local salary systems.
2. Collect examples of alternative compensation models being implemented around the country. Explore the funding sources and levels that are used to fund these alternative models. Analyze these models for their strengths and weaknesses if used in Washington.
3. Review the major categories for alternative compensation:
 - a. Knowledge- and Skill-Based Pay
 - b. Group Performance Incentive
 - c. Individual Performance/Incentive Awards
 - d. Career Ladder/Lattice
 - e. Market-Based Pay
 - f. Certification Level
4. Agree on the major categories and develop common definitions for the categories, as well as pros and cons for each based on Washington State.

⁸ Washington State Institute for Public Policy. *Beginning Teacher Survey*. Olympia, WA, 1999.

5. Design the components of alternative compensation systems which could augment the current Washington State Allocation Model (SAM) or replace the SAM. Analyze the impact of these components, the cost of each and the respective strengths and weaknesses.

The study group will periodically present its findings to the PESB. Once the study group has completed its analysis of research and best practices and developed potential implications for Washington's salary allocation model, the PESB will convene forums of educators statewide to discuss the implications of what has been learned.

LEADERSHIP IN SUPPORT OF LEARNING

“Good school principals are the keystones of good schools. Without the principal’s leadership, efforts to raise student achievement cannot succeed” – Educational Research Service

This past April, the Senate Education Committee requested that the PESB examine two issues related to school principals that were the subject of proposed legislation (SB 5667) during the 2001 session.

1. Should principal preparation and certification continue to require a valid teaching certificate?
2. Should districts continue to be restricted to hiring only certified principals?

There are several policy considerations embedded in these two questions:

- Must the certificate be a valid certificate (as opposed to the individual having held a certificate at some point)?
- Is teaching experience the only acceptable prerequisite experience (as opposed to other school-based experience such as school counselors, or non-school-based experience such as leaders in other fields)?
- With the current and future projected shortages, should we allow individuals with strong leadership or other relevant skills to serve uncertified as school principals?

The PESB assigned a subcommittee of members representing school principals, teachers, higher education teacher preparation programs and parents to explore these questions. The subcommittee reviewed a variety of perspectives from education literature and comparative state policy. They considered these questions both out of concern about principal shortages, as well as consideration of the current constraints on path the to the principalship, regardless of shortages.

The PESB also felt that in responding to these specific policy questions, it is important to consider them in a broader context of the changing role and responsibilities of school principals, and Washington’s movement toward implementing a new performance-based system of principal preparation and certification. Policy change is often like throwing a stone in a pond – it creates a ripple effect. Thus our examination of these questions will consider the stone and the pond – the immediate impact, and the potential longer-term issues for study and action that changes in this area may prompt.

2001 Action Summary – Principal Profession

In response to legislative request and as part of our broader mandate, the PESB:

- 1. Examined the issue of changes in principals’ roles and responsibilities;**
- 2. Engaged in collaborative efforts to implement new performance-based standards for principal preparation and certification;**
- 3. Adopted subcommittee recommendations with regards to prerequisite experience for principals; and**
- 4. Identified implications of these recommendations and possible future direction.**

1. THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN CREATING EFFECTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

The role of principal is growing in scope, importance, and demands, but fewer individuals are stepping forward to assume this challenging position. Washington school districts report principal shortages from “slight” to “severe”, and with 20% of currently employed principals eligible for retirement in the next four years, this shortage may likely become more severe.⁹ In addition, our principal workforce does not reflect the diversity of Washington State. Ninety percent of our elementary school principals and 92% of our secondary school principals are white, and although 55% of our elementary principals are female, only 32% of our secondary principals are female.

New demands on the job are a major factor affecting the desire of individuals to become principals. A survey of 403 school districts nationwide asked superintendents to identify the factors that most discourage individuals from applying for the principalship. Inadequate compensation ranked first at 60%, but also ranking high were factors that may help explain why the compensation is considered inadequate, including “job too stressful” (32%), and “too much time required” (27%).¹⁰

At one time, the role of principal focused primarily on the efficient management of student programs, teachers and facilities. With an increased emphasis on higher standards for students and accountability for school-wide results, however, the principal must focus more on their crucial role in creating effective learning environments, increasing student achievement and school-wide strategies for continuous improvement.

Most agree that principals must be first and foremost qualified instructional leaders. Generally, instructional leadership refers to having responsibility for defining school mission, promoting a positive learning climate, observing and giving feedback to teachers, managing curriculum and instruction, and assessing the instructional program.¹¹

“Principals create conditions in which teachers can teach more effectively and students can learn better”

— Phillip Hallinger

At the same time, the need for principals to tend to the day-to-day demands of school management hasn’t gone away. Principals are often also expected to be data-driven instructional leaders, creative resource managers, supervisors, evaluators, visionaries, goal setters and the ones responsible for creating and maintaining safe school environments.

Given the enormous responsibilities the job now encompasses, some believe we should redefine the job description. Many believe, including Seattle Pacific University researcher Jeffrey Fouts, that, “Given the multiple roles that the principal is now expected to play, it may be time to move away from the current model in which management and instructional leadership responsibilities

⁹ Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. *Educator Supply and Demand in Washington*. Olympia, WA. 2001.

¹⁰ Educational Research Service. *Is There a Shortage of Qualified Candidates for Openings in the Principalship? An Exploratory Study*. Arlington, VA. 1998.

¹¹ Weber, J. Leading the Instructional Program. In *School Leadership: Handbook for Excellence*, 2nd Edition. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. 1989 (ED309504)

are vested in one individual”.¹² Others suggest that in many cases this is impractical, and in some smaller school settings unnecessary. Differing types and sizes of schools, and schools that may have particular challenges are all a factor in the scope of responsibilities of a principal. In some settings the principal may be able to handle it all, in others there may be greater need to think of the principal as a facilitative leader, enabling a variety of leadership roles among staff as appropriate for that school. As a recent report from the Institute for Educational Leadership stated,

“While the principal must provide the leadership essential for student learning, the roles of the principal and of other school staff can be restructured to reinforce that leadership and manage the implementation of the school program effectively. Responsibilities for getting the work done can be distributed among a leadership team or given to others as specific functions. For example, some principals might want to be directly involved in providing instructional leadership, where others might want that to be the role of an especially skilled administrator or master teacher, allowing the principal to concentrate more time on another priority, such as parental involvement or school culture and safety.”¹³

Although, ultimately the “buck stops” with the principal; new models of school leadership imply a range of possibilities for differentiated roles and shared responsibilities. For today’s principals, the goal is not always to actually “do it” but to see that “it” happens.

All of this has obvious implications for the training needed to be an effective school leader. Even in settings where leadership is distributed, the principal must have the training and experience necessary to recognize whether what needs to happen is indeed happening and identify and implement necessary improvements. To ensure principals have the skills regardless of setting, principal training must be based on clear standards that reflect what all future school leaders should know and be able to do. Washington in fact has begun the process of putting into place new standards for our school leaders of tomorrow.

2. DEVELOPING A NEW SYSTEM OF PRINCIPAL PREPARATION AND CERTIFICATION

Washington is well underway in its efforts to implement a new performance-based system of principal preparation and certification. The PESB is part of a working group representing the Association of Washington School Principals, OSPI, Washington Council for Education Administration Programs, Washington Association of School Administrators, the State Board of Education, and the Governor’s Policy Office that has been meeting for over a year to provide guidance and direction for the implementation of a system of principal development focused on performance-based leadership standards. These new standards are based on model standards developed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), which have been

¹² Fouts, J., Stuen, C., Anderson, M.A., Parnell, T. The Reality of Reform: Factors Limiting the Reform of Washington’s Elementary Schools. Seattle, WA: Seattle Pacific University School of Education. 2000.

¹³ Task Force on the Principalsip. *Leadership for Student Learning: Reinventing the Principalsip*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership. 2000.

adopted by more than 30 states. It is the intent of this working group to submit a comprehensive package of proposed rule changes to the State Board of Education in May or June 2002.

This work is directly related to the question of whether individuals other than teachers should be allowed to pursue principal preparation and certification. One of the strengths and utilities of a performance-based system is that it is defined by well-articulated standards for what new principals should know and be able to do in any setting, and individuals must demonstrate their competence related to those standards before they can become principals. This is in marked contrast to a system defined by inputs, such as specified courses and credit hours, which means everyone goes through the same preparation, thus making it important that they all have the same background and experience. A system based on demonstrated competence can accommodate a broader range of background experiences and compensate to some degree with varying preparation options. For example, an individual without teaching experience, but with experience as a school counselor may already demonstrate competency on principal standards related to establishing school culture and communicating effectively with personnel, but may need greater focus on supervising and evaluating instruction.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS ON PRINCIPAL PREREQUISITES FOR STATE POLICYMAKERS

Question 1: Can principals without teaching experience provide the leadership needed to create effective learning environments in schools?

The first and immediate reaction of our subcommittee was, “Of course they have to have teaching experience!” Our review of the literature discussed above, examination of other states’ practices, and our own state’s planned shift to a principal preparation and certification system rooted in performance-based standards, however, yielded a very different perspective.

Table 2 depicts the various states requirements for principals with regards to prerequisite experience. Twenty-eight states require teaching experience for applicants for principal certification. Seventeen require a current/valid teaching certificate. In most states that do not require teaching experience, other forms of education experience are required and/or candidates gain school and classroom-based experience through participation in an intensive internship experience.

For our subcommittee, one of the biggest questions was whether principals who have not taught could be effective in supervising and evaluating teaching staff. Undeniably, principals who are able to draw from their own successes and failures as a teacher have an added frame of reference and experience that can help them assist other teachers. However, we believe there are three factors that make it possible for individuals with school-based experience, but without teaching experience, to supervise and evaluate teaching staff:

1. The most valid forms of evaluation focus on student learning and behavior in classrooms, recognizing that there are multiple instructional styles that can yield desired student behavior. Under this model, the evaluator and teacher work collaboratively to assess what is occurring in the classroom in terms of student learning and together identify what needs to change, including what support, resources, and professional growth the teacher needs to improve student learning in that classroom.
2. As discussed above, as school principals are increasingly looking at shared responsibility and teacher leadership, more are involving experienced teachers with training in evaluation in peer review models of teacher evaluation.
3. Successful experience as a teacher alone is not adequate preparation for supervising or evaluating other teachers. Any principal, with teaching experience or without, needs solid training in evaluation as a part of a preservice preparation program.

What we've come to believe reflects what we'd learned about the changing role of principals. As University of Washington professor John Goodlad summarizes well, "A principal is someone who can create a culture of teaching and learning and weave together the disparate pieces of the school environment. Principals aren't necessarily picked because they were good teachers". Marc Tucker of the Center for Education and the Economy agrees. "I don't think principals ought to be 'super teachers' . . . what the principal really has to understand is what it takes to improve achievement in the school."¹⁴

RECOMMENDATION FOR STATE POLICYMAKERS

The PESB believes it is time to expand entry to principal preparation beyond only those with teaching experience. The PESB also believes that schools and districts have the ability, and need the opportunity, to identify and develop school leadership potential in individuals beyond their teaching staff. The PESB, therefore, recommends an amendment to law (RCW 28A.400) currently limiting the hiring of school principals to those holding valid teaching certificates. At this time, with the shift to performance-based standards just getting underway, our recommendation is to begin with a modest expansion to include certified Educational Staff Associates with demonstrated successful school-based experience in an instructional role with students. As Washington implements its new performance-based standards, the PESB will continue to study implications for opening preparation and certification of principals further to include others with education experience, such as district central office administrators, and possibly non-educators with other types of leadership experience. Building on our successful implementation of new alternative routes to teacher certification, the PESB will also provide state policymakers with options for high-quality, performance-based alternative routes to principal certification.

The PESB also recommends to the State Board of Education that in amending corresponding Washington Administrative Code for certification, admission to administrator preparation programs for ESAs require a letter of recommendation from personnel in the district in a supervisory position. This supports the notion of districts identifying and "growing" future leaders from among their current staff.

¹⁴ Olson, L. New Thinking on What Makes a Leader. *Education Week*. January 19, 2000.

Table 2 - State Principal Certification Requirements

State	Master's required	2 tier	Cert by grade level	Required yrs of experience	Teaching experience only	Currently hold valid teaching certificate	Test required
Alabama	X	X		2		X	Institution Designed
Alaska	X			3	X	"recency credits"	
Arizona	X			3	X	?	
Arkansas	?		X	4	X	X	Praxis II
California		X		3			CBEST
Colorado	(for 2 nd tier)	X		3	X	X	PLACE
Connecticut	X			50 months	X		
Delaware	X	X	X	3	X		PRAXIS I
Florida	X	X		3	X		CLAST and FELE
Georgia	?	?	?	?	?	?	
Hawaii	X	X		5	X		PPST, PLT and PRA XIS
Idaho	X			4			
Illinois	X			2			
Indiana	X	X	X	5	X	X	
Iowa	X		X	5	X		
Kansas	X		X	3			
Kentucky	X	X		3			SLLA & KPT
Louisiana	X	X	X	5	X	X	NTE
Maine	X			3	X		
Maryland	X	X		3		X	SLLA
Massachusetts	X			3	X		
Michigan							
Minnesota	X			3	X		
Mississippi	X	X					SLLA
Missouri	X	X	X	2	X	X	X
Montana	X			3	X	X	
Nebraska		X	X	?	?	?	X
Nevada	X	?		3	X	X	
New Hampshire	X			3	X	X	PRAXIS I
New Jersey	X	X		?	?	?	NTE
New Mexico	X			?		X	NTE or NMTA
New York	X	X		3			Under Consideration
North Carolina	X			?	?	?	PRAXIS
North Dakota	X		X	3	X	X	
Ohio			X	3	X		X
Oklahoma	X		X	2			X
Oregon	X	X	X	3	?	?	PRAXIS
Pennsylvania	X			5		X	SLLA
Rhode Island	X	X	X	3	X		
South Carolina	X			3	X	X	PRAXIS II
South Dakota	X		X	4	X		
Tennessee	X			1			PRAXIS
Texas	X			2	X		X
Utah	X	X		2			?
Vermont	?	X	?	3	X		
Virginia	X			3	X		SLLA required if they start on or after July 1, 2001
Washington	X	X		3	X	X	
West Virginia	X	X		3			PRAXIS II
Wisconsin	X			3	X	X	
Wyoming	X		X	3	X	X	

Question 2: Should districts be restricted to hiring only certified principals?

The PESB believes strongly that districts should hire only certified principals. Certification is how state policymakers provide citizens with assurance that those in the position have met a defined level of competence to serve in that role. As we demonstrated in establishing alternative routes for teachers, there may be more creative, flexible routes through which individuals may demonstrate competency, but we must uphold a uniform set of high standards for all entering into the profession.

As indicated in our discussion above, Washington State is in the process of finalizing the new standards for residency certification, the initial level of principal certification, and PESB is collaborating with other agencies and associations to define those standards. These standards are based on those developed by the Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) and are being examined closely and modified as needed for Washington State. Just as the residency standards and performance-based system for teachers provided for options for preparation, these standards for principal certification will allow for more flexibility in preparation programs, including the development of alternative routes to principal certification.

4. IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT

Addressing the specific policy questions assigned us raised as many questions as we answered. These are questions and issues which the PESB will continue to explore.

District Support for New Models of School Leadership

Regardless of changes in policy affecting who and how we train as school leaders, if district superintendents, school boards, school staff, and the community do not believe in and support new types of school leadership, it will not happen. The school superintendent plays a particularly crucial role in supporting this change. This has implications for preparation and professional development of school superintendents that ensures they can envision and support better models of school leadership. State policymakers can play a role in creating incentives to encourage districts to pilot new types of school leadership and governance.

Principal Decision Making Authority/Autonomy

Likewise, empowering principals with new leadership skills will have little meaning if principals are hindered from making the decisions necessary to creating effective learning environments. In Seattle Pacific University Professor Jeff Fouts' study of factors limiting the reform of Washington's elementary schools, principals interviewed listed two major factors as those most crucial to the ability of principals to improve struggling schools:

1. Flexibility in policies and regulations, specifically those related to time and administrative support; and
2. Control of staffing decisions, including hiring, transfer, and dismissal authority.¹⁵

¹⁵ Fouts, J., Stuen, C., Anderson, M.A., Parnell, T. (2000). The Reality of Reform: Factors Limiting the Reform of Washington's Elementary Schools. Seattle, WA: Seattle Pacific University School of Education.

Unduly restricting the authority of principals will affect the kind of leaders willing to take on the job and hinder the effectiveness of those who do.

Unintended Domino Affect

While the notion of shared leadership that empowers teachers to assume greater roles and responsibilities in schools is appealing to most educators, teachers also are concerned about being expected to take on a great deal of extra responsibility and added workload which could adversely impact their students and for which they would not receive additional monetary compensation.

New Frontier for Preparation Programs

A new system of performance-based preparation and certification for principals poses strong new challenges for higher education preparation programs. A one-size-fits-all approach to preparation cannot work. More tailored programs based on an individual's varying experience, strengths and weaknesses will be required.

EDUCATIONAL STAFF ASSOCIATES – SUPPORTING ALL STUDENTS

School Psychologists, Speech and Language Pathologists and Audiologists, School Counselors, School Nurses, Occupational Therapists, Physical Therapists and School Social Workers. These are the professionals without whom a significant number of students would be unable to reach their potential as learners. Educational Staff Associates (ESAs) address the physical, emotional, social, and educational competence of all students. They strengthen the foundation on which learning can occur. They work collaboratively with teachers and other educators in promotion of the whole child and the total educational process. They are trained to work with students in areas beyond the expertise of teachers and other school staff. These seven categories of specially trained educators are certified by the state of Washington. The requirements of certification for ESAs are extensive. Table 3 depicts the current requirements for initial and continuing certification of each category of ESA in Washington State.

The Senate Education committee requested that the PESB address two issues related to ESAs which have been the focus of legislation. They are:

1. Should ESAs who achieve national certification receive a salary increase similar to that awarded teachers who achieve certification through the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards?
2. Should years of non-school experience receive recognition on the state salary allocation schedule for ESAs?

The PESB has also discussed the shortage and retention issues for ESAs, which are a concern for Washington schools. Washington has a shortage of school counselors, school psychologists, speech-language pathologists, and social workers that well exceeds the national average. Districts report slight to severe shortages for all categories of ESAs.¹⁶

1. RECOGNITION OF ESA NATIONAL CERTIFICATION

Washington State has provided monetary recognition for teachers who achieve certification through the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Each of the seven categories of ESAs also has a process for national certification and thus ESAs have requested similar monetary recognition of their national certification. Table 3 also depicts the national certification requirements for each category of ESA.

¹⁶ Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. *Educator Supply and Demand in Washington*. Olympia, WA. 2001

TABLE 3 - ESA STATE AND NATIONAL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

	Teachers	Counselors	Physical Therapists	Speech & Lang Pathologists / Audiologists	Nurses	Occupational Therapists	School Psychologists	Social Workers
Initial Cert	Residency Certification: Bachelor's degree in an endorsement area from accredited college/Univ + completion of approved teacher prep program	Master's Degree in Counseling (except thesis or special project) Written exam from accredited graduate program or National Counselor Examination	Valid WA PT license Baccalaureate degree from an American PT Assoc accredited program 30 clock hours, or 3-quarter hours, of courses related to ESA role in a school. (can be issued 180 day temporary permit prior to coursework completion)	Master's Degree (except thesis or special project) from American Speech & Hearing Assoc accredited with major in speech path or audiology including written examination or passing Ntl Teacher Exam in speech path or audiology 30 clock hours, or 3-quarter hours, of courses related to ESA role in a school. (can be issued 180 day temporary permit prior to coursework completion)	RN license Baccalaureate degree in Nursing 30 clock hours, or 3 quarter hours, of courses related to ESA role in a school. (can be issued 180 day temporary permit prior to coursework completion)	Valid WA OT license Baccalaureate degree from American OT Assoc accredited program 30 clock hours, or 3-quarter hours, of coursework related to ESA role in a school. (can be issued 180 day temporary permit prior to coursework completion)	Master's Degree specializing in School Psychology (except thesis or special project) Written exam from accredited graduate program or National Certification of School Psychologists Exam Or Hold certification through the National School Psychology Certification Board	Master's Degree in Social Work (except thesis or special project) Written exam from accredited graduate program or Academy of Certified Social Workers Examination or National Teacher – School Social Worker Specialty Exam
Continuing/ Professional Cert	Professional Cert – completed provisional status + state approved professional cert program Or Certification through National Board for Professional Teaching Standards	Master's Degree in Counseling (all requirements) 180 days employment 1 quarter or semester course that includes peer review 10 clock hours of coursework in child abuse	15 quarter hours (10 semester hours) post-baccalaureate in PT or other health sciences or ed 10 clock hours of coursework in child abuse	Master's in speech path or audiology 180 days employment 10 clock hours of coursework in child abuse	45 quarter hours (30 semester hours) post-baccalaureate work in education, nursing, or other health sciences 180 days employment 10 clock hours of coursework in child abuse	10 clock hours of coursework in child abuse	Master's Degree specializing in School Psychology (all requirements) 180 days employment 1 quarter or semester course including peer review 10 clock hours of coursework in child abuse	Master's Degree in Social Work (all requirements) 180 days employment 1 quarter or semester course including peer review 10 clock hours of coursework in child abuse

	Teachers	Counselors	Physical Therapists	Speech & Lang Pathologists / Audiologists	Nurses	Occupational Therapists	School Psychologists	Social Workers
National Cert	<p>National Board for Professional Teaching Standards</p> <p>Year-long process – 2 major parts:</p> <p>Portfolio - videotaped teaching, student work samples and other teaching artifacts, and detailed analyses of practice.</p> <p>Assessment – performance-based and constructed response items assessing content and pedagogy</p>	<p>National Board for Certified Counselors</p> <p>Coursework and Internship (likely completed to receive initial/continuing cert?) + 2 years post-Master's, professional endorsement and passing score on National Counseling Examination – 200 items multiple choice exam</p>	<p>American Physical Therapy Association</p> <p>Pediatric Specialists Certificate</p> <p>2,000 hours direct patient care in specialty area + successful passage of examination</p>	<p>Clinical Cert Board of American Speech Language Hearing Association</p> <p>Masters from accredited program (required for initial cert) + 36 week supervised clinical fellowship w/ supervisory evaluation + passing score on 2hr, 150 multiple choice National SLP Exam</p>	<p>National Board for Certification of School Nurses</p> <p>RN + bachelor's degree (requirements for initial cert) + 3 years experience in school nursing (2 beyond cont cert requirement) + passing score on 250 multiple choice item exam</p>	<p>National Board for Certification in Occupational Therapy</p> <p>Accredited program and related fieldwork (required for initial/cont cert) + passing score on national exam</p>	<p>National School Psychology Certification Board</p> <p>Coursework and Internship in school setting (likely completed to receive initial /continuing cert?) + passing score on National School Psychology Exam – 2-hr multiple choice exam</p>	<p>National Association of Social Workers – school social work specialist certificate</p> <p>Master's from accredited program and 2 years post master's work experience as school social worker (1 years beyond requirement for continuing cert) + supervisory and peer evaluation + passing score on one of 6 possible exams</p>
Years Valid	10	5 years	10 years	1 year	5	5	3 years	2 years
Cost	\$2,300	\$275	\$1,150 members; \$2175 non-members	\$406	\$175 members; \$250 non-members	\$450	\$80 members/\$120 non-members	\$120
Renewal		100 hours of continuing ed or retake and pass exam \$35 annual "maintenance" fee	200 hours/year direct patient care in specialist area + successful passage of exam or portfolio of professional practice	\$406 annually	75 hours of continuing ed or retake and pass exam	Completing renewal form and \$75	75 hours continuing ed	20 hours of continuing ed + \$50

Examining these requirements raises several issues / questions:

What are the factors that should be used to determine whether ESAs should be eligible for salary recognition?

- a. Will certification in the ESA area be available through the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards?

NBPTS will have national certification for school counselors by 2002. NBPTS does not plan to have certification for any other category of ESA.

- b. Is the ESA national certification of comparable rigor to NBPTS standards/process (i.e. standards require demonstrated accomplished practice, include peer review; must go beyond clock hours)?

NBPTS certification is an extremely rigorous process requiring an average of 300 hours of portfolio development, videotaping of classroom teaching, and completion of performance-based and extended response item assessments on content and pedagogy. ESAs vary considerably in their requirements for national certification. Some require an extremely rigorous, time-consuming process and supervised clinical experience beyond the estimated 300 hours for NBPTS certification, while others require only the completion of a multiple-choice test.

- c. Does the ESA national certification exceed normal requirements of the position held? Is participation voluntary? To what degree do requirements exceed those required for state ESA certification?

NBPTS certification is not required for certification or for purposes of hiring for teaching in Washington. Likewise, ESA national certification is not required for certification or employment. However, there is a greater degree of overlap between requirements for continuing certification and national certification for various ESAs than currently exists between teaching professional-level certification and NBPTS certification.

- d. Is there a demonstrated positive impact of national certification on classroom/school/student?

NBPTS' research efforts have focused on the impact of NBPTS certification on students. This was a compelling rationale for Washington legislators, who supported the notion of salary recognition for NBPTS teachers in part as an incentive for more teachers to pursue NBPTS certification. Most ESAs are routinely required to document and demonstrate their positive impact on students through the requirements of Individual Education Plans for students.

2. SALARY RECOGNITION FOR NON-SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

ESAs serving in other clinical settings who decide to enter a school setting receive no recognition for past years of experience, although their experience may be highly similar and contributes to their work in school settings. For example, a speech and language pathologist

working with children in an institutional setting who becomes certified to work in a school setting will receive no credit for that time on the state salary allocation schedule. Similar to the difficulty districts have in securing teachers and administrators, many districts are having great difficulty filling open ESA positions. In OSPI's 2000 Educator Supply and Demand report, all seven categories of ESAs are reported as experiencing from "slight" to "considerable" shortages. As a result of shortages, many districts are contracting out for ESA services at a higher cost.

OPTIONS FOR STATE POLICYMAKERS

The PESB believes that ESA's relevant past experience should be recognized on the salary allocation model. However, we also recognize that this situation is not unique to ESAs and believe policymakers should consider this in the broader context of the limitations of the salary allocation model. For example, the PESB believes that the relevant past experience of midcareer professionals who enter teaching through alternative route or traditional teacher preparation programs should have their relevant experience recognized as well. In addition, the salary allocation model sets a maximum level of experience (16 years) beyond which teachers no longer receive additional compensation. Recognition of relevant experience on the salary allocation schedule must be implemented in a way that is equitable and available to all certified educators.

After considerable study and discussion, the PESB recommends that ESA compensation be considered in light of a broader statewide reform of educator compensation. As part of that reform, the PESB specifically recommends the consideration of compensation for ESA's that:

- Recognizes relevant professional non-school experience in determining salary allocation
- Provides salary compensation for all master's degree level national certification with three years of school experience

ACTION STEPS FOR STATE POLICYMAKERS

The recommendations below are intended to reflect sensitivity to current fiscal constraints. Thus, those action steps listed as “immediate” are low or no additional cost policy options. Those listed “future” are those the PESB has studied and believe must be planned for now and addressed in coming biennia. These recommendations are discussed in greater detail in the previous sections of this report. They are summarized here for easy reference.

IMMEDIATE:

1. Amend current law (RCW 28A.400) which limits the hiring of school principals to those holding valid teaching certificates.
 - With the shift to a new system of performance-based standards and certification for principals just getting underway, the PESB recommends a modest expansion to include certified Educational Staff Associates with demonstrated successful school-based experience in an instructional role with students. As Washington implements its new performance-based standards, the PESB will continue to study and provide policymakers with options for opening preparation and certification of principals further to include others with education experience, such as district central office administrators, and possibly non-educators with other types of leadership experience. Building on our successful implementation of new alternative routes to teacher certification, the PESB will also provide state policymakers with options for high-quality, performance-based alternative routes to principal certification.
2. Adjust timeline for subject knowledge tests required for residency teaching certification from 2003 to 2005 to accommodate State Board of Education’s timeline on implementation of new subject endorsement competencies.
3. Ensure that all beginning teachers are provided a highly skilled mentor by re-examining support for mentor training with attention to statewide scalability. Support a model of mentor training that:
 - Includes a “trainer of trainers” track in the existing statewide mentor training academy so that large districts or districts unable to send multiple individuals to the state academy can send staff who will in turn train district mentors.
 - Provides opportunity for technical assistance and review to districts already providing mentor-training programs on how they might improve their training and better align it with statewide goals.

FUTURE:

1. Increase support for alternative route programs, focusing first on expanding access and support for classified instructional staff.
2. Improve systems to yield better data for decision-making
 - Improve coordination and scope of statewide data-collection systems that can identify needs in the state’s educator workforce. Supply and demand data needs to be collected on a regular basis, should identify shortages regionally, and be related to regional student enrollment projections and teacher preparation program capacity by region.

3. Move from competition between districts to statewide strategies for filling shortages
 - Improve coordination and management of statewide recruitment of educators, driven by data projecting which districts will have shortages and in what areas, and targets recruitment efforts accordingly. Examine the authenticity of current systems of recruitment in terms of whether they are reaching communities of color and encouraging students of color to pursue a future career in teaching
4. Shape the future educator supply today:
 - Consider new ways to encourage higher education to take into account current and projected teacher supply and demand in planning for addition or reductions to educator preparation program offerings and in their enrollment practices.
 - Provide financial incentives for students to pursue preparation and certification in subject and geographic shortages areas.
 - Support teaching academy programs that provide coursework and internships to middle and high school students interested in a teaching career. Encourage articulation between these programs, community colleges and four-year institutions. Pursue options for students in teaching academy programs to receive credits toward community college or teacher preparation program requirements.
5. Consider changes in ESA compensation together with any broader statewide reform of educator compensation. As part of that reform, the PESB specifically recommends the consideration of compensation for ESA's that:
 - Recognizes relevant professional non-school experience in determining salary allocation
 - Provides salary compensation for all master's degree level national certification with three years of school experience

BASED ON FORTHCOMING RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PESB:

- Examine ways to provide greater support and flexibility for districts that want to create new models of school leadership. Based on future recommendations of PESB, consider greater flexibility with regards to authority of school principals over key decisions and examine implications for principal preparation.
- Implement alternative routes for principal certification based on future recommendations of the Professional Educator Standards Board.
- Elevate the career and compensation structure of the teaching profession to match the importance of the work. Consider recommendations from PESB/WEA/OSPI/OFM Compensation Study Group for new alternative compensation models.

PESB FUTURE FOCUS / AGENDA

Continued Systems Focus

The PESB will step up its efforts to serve as a vehicle for connecting policymakers with the various initiatives in Washington State aimed at improving educator quality. We will continue to collaborate with others in maintaining a coherent and comprehensive focus on the full continuum of educators' professional development – from recruitment through retirement. Taking into consideration all stages of an educator's career development is extremely valuable to helping policymakers identify the gaps where policy changes and support are needed.

Convene forums on policy options for improving educator quality

The PESB will assume a more active role in bringing state policymakers together with researchers and practitioners to discuss specific educator quality issues.

Issue-Based Study and Policy Recommendations

The PESB has identified a number of issues critical to educator professionals that we believe are in need of attention at this point in time. In addition, the PESB will continue to respond to requests from state policymakers to address specific policy questions and issues.

The items below are discussed in greater detail in the previous sections of this report. They are included here for easy reference.

▪ Teacher Evaluation

Six Washington school districts are piloting a new system of teacher evaluation that places teachers at the center of decision-making on what students are doing in the classroom. Research is clear on the kinds of student behaviors that are necessary for learning. There is much less clarity on whether one instructional method is superior to another. Thus teachers can make choices on how they will instruct, while focusing on what they want to see students doing as a result. This program ensures that a teacher sets professional growth goals in collaboration not only with the principal, but with other teachers in the building as well.

▪ Future of Alternative Routes to Teaching and Alternative Routes to Principal Certification

The PESB's implementation and evaluation of the Alternative Routes Partnership Grant Program and the Transition to Teaching Grant Program will yield important information that will help answer questions such about the future of alternative route programs in Washington, such as:

- Did these programs make a difference in recruiting nontraditional candidates and in helping districts fill teaching shortages?
- Can site-based district/higher education partnerships adequately extend the reach of teacher preparation programs to candidates unable/unwilling to participate in campus-based programs? What more/different needs to be done?

In addition, once the State Board of Education adopts the new standards for principal residency certification, the PESB is committed to developing recommendations for performance-based alternative routes to principal certification.

- **Assessment of Prospective Teachers and School Leaders**

Given the PESB's ongoing charge with regard to assessment of prospective teachers, we will work closely with the Association of Washington School Principals and OSPI as they consider various means for assessing principals against new performance-based standards.

- **Models of School Leadership – Implications for Principal Preparation and Development**

One of the challenges posed by the need to rethink the many roles and responsibilities placed on school principals is how to uphold high and consistent standards that all principals should obtain, while at the same time giving school districts the flexibility they need to create varying models of school leadership that will best further their improvement goals and allow them to hire the leaders they need to make it happen. Building on the beginning work of the principal subcommittee, the PESB will examine ways to provide districts the flexibility and support for implementing more effective models of school leadership.

- **Professional Development of Educators**

The PET report stated that, *“The state has neither a sustaining, coherent vision for the career-long professional development of its teachers, nor the capacity to provide this type of development and that more information is needed on the nature and utility of professional development and the degree to which it is aligned with state standards.”* This might be said for administrators and ESAs as well. The PESB will look at various aspects of educator professional development, including:

- Implementation of the professional certificate and development of professional growth plans for teachers
- Continuing education requirements in light of movement toward a performance-based system
- Exemplars of high-quality professional development

- **Recruitment/Retention of Educators**

In addition to offering competitive pay and benefits, states that are aggressively recruiting educators to fill shortages have examined their current systems of recruitment and developed statewide strategies that aim to draw candidates to all districts experiencing shortages, rather than leave districts to compete with one another. The PESB will examine how Washington can implement a more coordinated statewide recruitment system driven by data projecting which districts will have shortages and in what areas, and targets recruitment efforts accordingly. We will expand our focus to consider superintendent shortages as well. Thirty-six percent of currently employed superintendents will be eligible for retirement in the next four years. Districts are already experiencing difficulty in filling superintendent vacancies.

States and districts that are successful in achieving diversity through recruitment examine the authenticity of recruitment systems - to learn whether they are reaching communities of color and encouraging students of color to pursue a future career in education. How are we marketing/advertising? Where are we recruiting? Who are we encouraging to pursue teaching? Studies show that some strategies work better than others in terms of recruiting for diversity, including utilizing nontraditional networks, understanding how diverse prospective teachers perceive the profession in Washington, utilizing a support and

recruitment network of teachers of color, expanding opportunities for paraprofessionals to become fully-certified teachers, and recruiting future teachers by raising interest of middle and high school students in an educator career. The PESB will examine research and best practices from other states for implications for practice in Washington.

The PESB will also take a closer look at the success of teaching academy programs in recruiting future teachers, focusing on middle and high school students.

- **Alternative Compensation Models**

The PESB will continue its work with the compensation study group it convened last September composed of technical staff from the Office of Financial Management, OSPI, and WEA to work collaboratively over an 18-month period with the goal of:

- Creating a knowledge base of the current compensation structure being used in Washington State;
- Collecting examples of alternative compensation models being implemented around the country;
- Reviewing the major categories for alternative compensation, such as knowledge- and skill-based pay;
- Designing the components of alternative compensation systems which could augment or replace the current Washington State Allocation.

The study group will periodically present its findings to the PESB. Once the study group has completed its analysis of research and best practices and developed potential implications for Washington's salary allocation model, the PESB will convene forums of educators statewide to discuss the implications of what has been learned.

- **Data for Decision Making**

Policymakers need relevant, reliable data on which to base important policy decisions. Washington needs to support a better-coordinated, comprehensive data-collection system that can identify needs in the state's teacher workforce. The PESB will examine existing systems and areas for improvement, with a particular emphasis on educator supply and demand data.